JKAU: Arts & Humanities, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp: 91-110 (2008 A.D. / 1429 A.H.)

Developmental Diglossia: Diglossic Switching and the Equivalence Constraint

Mona H. Sabir and **Sabah M.Z. Safi**

English Language Centre, and the Department of European Languages & Literature, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
monahtsabir@hotmail.com, Sabahsafi@hotmail.com

Abstract. Diglossic switching in the speech of adult Arabic speakers has been noted before. The phenomenon has not been observed before in the speech of preschoolers who have not been exposed to the High variety of Arabic through formal education. The present study provides evidence of diglossic codeswitching from the speech of a 5;6 month old child who seems to code-switch freely between the High variety or Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) and the Low variety or the Hejazi dialect (HjD) of Arabic. The child's code-switches appear to be rule- governed and show complete adherence to the Equivalence Constraint (Poplack 1980) reflecting an underlying competence of the syntactic structures of both varieties at a very young age. Additionally, the analysis reveals that verbs are the most frequently mixed linguistic items despite the fact that they are the most semantically and syntactically complex units in the sentence.

Keywords: Arabic, Code-switching, Equivalence Constraint, Diglossia, First Language Acquisition, Hejazi Dialect.

Introduction

Although diglossia and diglossic codeswitching have been observed before in the speech of adult native speakers of Arabic, the phenomenon has not been reported before in the speech of young Arabic preschoolers who have not been introduced to the High varicty of Arabic through formal education yet. This phenomenon, however, appears to be widespread. It seems to be triggered by the prevalence of cartoon films and children's programs in the Arab world that use the High variety of Arabic. As a result, the definition of diglossia – as has been originally

described by Charles Ferguson in 1959 and which has continued to be used unchallenged until today – needs to be modified to account for instances of *developmental diglossia* which we will describe here.

Background

Diglossia

In an attempt to characterize a certain type of language situation, (Ferguson, 1959; cited in Wei 2005) proposed the notion of Diglossia. He defined it as,

> "... a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent , highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but it is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation" (p.75).

The superposed variety is termed by Ferguson (1959) as the high (H) variety and the regional dialect as the low (L) variety.

Among the communities that are considered diglossic is the Arabic community. According to Ferguson (1959), the High variety in Arabic is called Al-FusHa which is the language of the Quraan (Muslims' Holy book) and the medium in which Arabs' literary heritage is mostly written. The High variety is only acquired through formal education. It is, thus, not considered the mother tongue of Arabs. On the other hand, Al-ammiyya or the Low variety is the language of daily communication. It is the variety acquired naturally from early childhood since it is the spoken dialect of parents, caretakers, and the community at large. And although Ferguson (1959) has argued that the High variety of diglossic communities is acquired through formal education, preschoolers within the Hejazi community in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia show evidence of starting to develop a sense of diglossia without having been subjected to formal education. The exposure to the High variety, however, may be due to the preponderance of television programs and cartoons that use the High variety rather than the regional dialect.

In spite of the fact that the native dialect of monolingual children in the Hejaz region is Urban Hejazi[1] (a Low variety), items from the High variety are freely mixed in their speech. Myers-Scotton claims that "it only makes sense that young children should develop a sense of diglossia because this is part of one's communicative competence (or, in terms of my Markedness Model, a sense of which choices are unmarked in certain contexts and which are marked)"[2]. In other words, based on some sort of innate mechanism which is then filled in with experience, children figure out what linguistic choices are appropriate in a given context.

Code-Switching

Code switching has been defined in several ways by various linguists. But for the purpose of this paper, the definition that has been adopted is "the use of two language varieties in the same conversation" (Myers-Scotton, 2006). Myers-Scotton (2006) also provides two types of code switching. The first type is *inter-sentential* where there is inclusion of full sentences in both varieties. The second type is *intra-sentential* switching where there are two clauses, each showing intra-clause switching. In addition to the term code switching, Heath (1989) uses the term diglossic switching when referring to the switch that occurs between Moroccan Colloquial Arabic (MCA) and Classical Arabic (CA). As such, both terms (*i.e.* code switching and diglossic switching) are used interchangeably throughout this paper focusing on intra-sentential code switching only.

Since 1959, hundreds of articles and a score of books have been published on the topic of diglossia. Most of the research on diglossia (Myers-Scotton 1986; Heath 1989; Maamouri 1998; Khamis-Dakwar 2006) centers on social, educational and linguistic factors that do not apply to young children. Additionally, studies that deal with the structural nature of diglossic switching are scarce.

It has been suggested that bilingual adult code-switching is guided by a specific set of structural constraints that form a part of a speaker's fundamental linguistic competence (Pfaff, 1979; Poplack, 1980, 1981; di

(1) The Hejazi dialect is spoken in the Western region of Saudi Arabia, mainly in the major cities of Jeddah, Madinah, and Makkah and in the surrounding towns and villages.

(2) (Myers-Scotton, personal communication, March 6th, 2006).

Sciullo, Muysken and Singh, 1986; cited in Clyne 2005). Structural constraints refer to restrictions on what elements from language A can be inserted, and where they can be inserted, into a sentence in language B, and thus refer to intra-sentential code-switching and not to the switching of single-language utterances between conversational turns (inter-sentential code switching) (Paradis, Nicoladis and Genesee, 2000). Regarding research on the structural aspects of children's code switching, Vihman (1998) examines the structural properties of bilingual children's code-mixed utterances with respect to the *violation* of specific constraints set out in the Matrix Language Frame (MLF) model of code-switching constraints (Myers Scotton, 1993, 1993a), and concludes that the structure of the children's code-mixes follows the predictions of this adult model.

Despite the fact that code switching between the High and the Low varieties in a diglossic situation has been extensively reported, no structural models have been used to characterize such switching since the varieties are predominantly similar. However, Poplack's Model (1980) of bilingual code switching – and particularly the *Equivalence Constraint* – is adopted here for two reasons; (a) it offers a separate criterion that describes instances of code switching at the phrase level, rather than an integrated, comprehensive set of constraints (like MLF of Scotton (1993, 1993a)) that deal with the morphemic level of code switching, and (b) it provides a framework to examine the child's adherence to structural constraints on code switching between two codes one in which he is assumed to have full competence (the Low variety) and the other in which he only shows traces of an emerging competence (the High variety).

The Equivalence Constraint

Poplack (1980, 1981) and Sankoff and Poplack (1981) propose two constraints which govern the interaction of the language systems. The first constraint is the *Free Morpheme Constraint* in which codes may be switched after any constituent provided that this constituent is not a bound morpheme. According to this constraint, code switching is disallowed between a lexeme and a bound morpheme unless the item is phonologically integrated into the base language. The second constraint is the *Equivalence Constraint*, defined as (...codes will tend to be switched at points where the surface structures of the languages map onto

each other). The idea behind the Equivalence Constraint is that code switches are allowed within constituents as long as the word order requirements of both languages are met at the sentence structure. To illustrate, the Equivalence Constraint predicts that the switch in (1) is disallowed.

Example (1)

*told *le,* le *told,* him *dije,* dije *him*

told *to-him,* to-him *I-told*, him *I-told*, I-told *him* '(I) told him'

(From Poplack, 1981; cited in MacSwan, 1999: 55).

Poplack (1980) suggested universal validity for both constraints, but several researchers provided counter-evidence from different languages, such as Moroccan Arabic/French, Spanish/Hebrew, and Italian/English (Bentahila and Davis, 1983; Berk-Seligson, 1986; and Belazi, Rubin and Toribio, 1994). Nevertheless, there is enough evidence from the adult's speech that code-switches between structurally diverse languages do not violate the Equivalence Constraint.

In this paper, the researchers would like to draw attention to the fact that Arabic speaking children at a very young age show sensitivity to syntactic boundaries or equivalence sites in spite of the fact that they have not fully developed the High variety of Arabic. Adopting Poplack's (1980) Equivalence Constraint will provide a structural framework for analyzing intra-sentential code-switches observed in the child's data. However, it should be noted that the distinction between Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) and Classical Arabic (CA) is not pertinent to this analysis.

Method

The Subject

The subject of this study is a five year, six month (5;6) old healthy monolingual child. He is a first born male (with a younger sister) to Hejazi university educated parents of mid socio-economic background. Although the parents are very well educated in the High variety of Arabic, they seldom use the spoken version of it professionally (the mother is a faculty member in the English Centre and the father is an administrator in a school) or indeed in any oral/spoken context around the child. The child is brought up in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia surrounded by

users of the Hejazi dialect (his native tongue). He is, however, exposed to cartoon films in the High variety of Arabic for about two hours a day. The child also attends a kindergarten that sometimes uses the High variety as a medium of instruction.

At the age of 5;6, the child's native language (HjD) is well-developed morphologically as well as syntactically. This is supported by many linguists who investigate the range of language development in children's speech. Tager-Flusberg (1989:153), for example, points out that "By the time children begin school, they have acquired most of the morphological and syntactic rules of their language". In other words, children of preschool age are in command of using their language in many ways, and their simple sentences, imperatives, questions and negatives are very much like those of the adults. Consequently, no MLU (Mean Length of Utterance) measurement was needed in this study.

The Data

The data for this paper were collected by one of the researchers over a period of nine months following the traditional notebook technique of recording on-line naturally occurring utterances of the child while interacting with parents, friends and sibling (none of whom actually uses the High variety of Arabic). Most of the utterances occurred in the child's home environment. Originally 115 utterances were collected. These utterances were written down by the mother (one of the researchers) in Arabic orthography immediately after being uttered and instances of diglossic switching were broadly transcribed. Sounds that could not be captured by orthography were transcribed using the IPA symbols. However, religious sayings were excluded from the data since they are memorized by the child in their High form. Consequently, their occurrence doesn't represent code switching; rather they form part of Arab's religious rehearsals that appear in the High form in all contexts and by all kinds of speakers. Finally, the remaining utterances (100) were categorized according to the syntactic position in which a diglossic switch takes place and to the syntactic category of the mixed item itself.

Results and Discussion

Utterances recorded from the child are mostly of simple grammatical linear order and most of his sentences are simple ones in which there is

no coordination or complexity. Types of simple sentences like statements, commands and questions constitute the data. Code switching instances of the child were classified first according to the syntactic category of the switched item to determine the syntactic position that each switched item occupies and whether this position maps onto either varieties (i.e., the H variety of MSA and the L variety of Hejazi dialect). Data show that verbs have the highest frequency of occurrence in diglossic switching although they are more complex than other categories in terms of their morphological structure. Table (1) below shows the percentage of diglossic switching classified by syntactic category.

Table 1. Distribution of child's code-switches according to syntactic category.

Syntactic Category	No of switches	Percentage
Single Nouns	12	12
Noun Phrases (N+Mod)	16	16
Pronouns	0	0
Single Verbs	28	28
Verb Phrases	8	8
Single Adjectives	20	20
Adjectival Phrases	0	0
Adverbs	8	8
Single Prepositions	0	0
Prepositional Phrases	8	8
Total	**100**	**100%**

The Verb Phrase

Most, if not all, of the Modern Standard Arabic verbs in the data could be considered Complement Phrases or CPs on their own[(3)]. For the purpose of the analysis, however, verbs which contain the verb stem plus any additional clitics indicating tense, number, person, aspect, and gender were considered single units, while verbs that are followed by a noun phrase or a prepositional phrase complement were considered verb phrases.

---

(3) (Myers-Scotton personal communication, March 6th, 2006).

Inserting a single verb from the High variety of Arabic into a sentence in the Low variety has the most frequent occurrence in the data. According to Sieny (1978), verbs in the Hejazi dialect typically act as clauses in miniature, predicates in verbal clauses, and heads in verb phrases. The same criteria are attested in Modern Standard Arabic where the verb occupies the same syntactic positions. However, the position of the verb in Modern Standard Arabic tends to be less disturbed than in the colloquial variety (Cantarino, 1974).

It is found that the child at this age is capable of producing utterances that are sensitive to the syntactic slots that should be occupied by a verb and to the slots that should be occupied by the verb complements. To illustrate the above remark, consider example (2) below where the underlined item is in the High variety form:

Example (2)

taani	maa	<u>?axðil-aki</u>
again	not	let down- you-(F)

'Next time I won't let you down'

In the above utterance, the diglossic switch is rule governed. The negative particle /maa/ is usually followed by a verb in the Hejazi dialect (Sieny, 1978). However, while the negative particle is in the Low form, the following verb comes in the High form. The verb /?axðil/ 'to disappoint or let down' is the High form of its counterpart in the Hejazi dialect /?afaʃʃil/. The form of the negative particle that precedes verbs in Modern Standard Arabic[4] in this case is /lan/. Accordingly, the diglossic switch occurs at a point where the syntactic position of the switched category maps onto both varieties.

Another instance of code switching that involves single verbs is shown in (3) below:

Example (3)

haada	?illi	kunt	<u>?an-taẓir-uh</u>
this	which	was-I	I-waiting for-it

'This is what I've been waiting for'

---

(4) Other negative particles in Modern Standard Arabic include (maa, laa, laysa, *etc*) (see Cantarino, 1974).

The word /kunt/ in (3) above is an auxiliary verb that is highly used in the Hejazi dialect and it may precede other standard or auxiliary verbs to form phrases that can act as one single unit. Auxiliaries are usually inflected for tense and subject and must be followed by verbs in the present tense form which are also sometimes inflected for tense, subject, and object (Sieny, 1978). The positioning of the verb after /kunt/ in the Hejazi dialect parallels the structure in Modern Standard Arabic. /kuntu/ which is the perfect of /kana/ 'to be' precedes another perfect verb in the High variety (Cantarino, 1974). Instead of using a verb in the Low form /ʔastanah/, the child strikingly uses a verb from the H variety /ʔantaẓir-uh/ in a position in which the syntactic requirement of the verb /kunt/ meets in both varieties.

Complete verb phrases that appear in the High form are also manifested in the data. Example (4) includes such kind of code switching:

Example (4)

ħa-<u>ʔulaqinu-hu</u>	<u>darsan</u>	<u>qaasiyan</u>
will- I- teach-him	a lesson	rough

'I'll teach him a rough lesson'

In the Hejazi dialect of Arabic, the inflectional marker that is used to indicate future tense is the marker /ħa/, borrowed from Egyptian Arabic (Sieny, 1978). This prefix is added to the verb in its present tense form such as in /ħa-tuktub/ 'she will write'. The future marker /ħa/ in (4) is followed by a verb in the High form /ʔulaqqin/ instead of a verb in the Low form. The counterpart of this marker in the High variety is /sa/ or /sawfa/ and they also require a verb to follow them. The child's utterance in (4) indicates applying the correct syntactic position of the future marker in the sentence and correct position of the verb. Furthermore, the verb /ʔulaqqin/ is a di-transitive verb which requires two objects as complements. The requirement of this verb is fulfilled by the child's production in (4) in which the noun phrase /darsan qaasiyan/ is the direct object that consists of the noun /darsan/ and the modifying adjective[(5)] /qaasiyan/; the bound pronoun /hu/ is the indirect object. Instances of

(5) In Arabic, adjectives follow nouns (see Wright, 1971).

diglossic switching like the one in (4) above clearly show obedience to the Equivalence Constraint.

Simple questions in the child's speech also exhibit verb phrases in the High variety form. Example (5) below shows code switching at a verb phrase level:

Example (5)

ti-ʕrif-u	keyf	?a-ħṣulu	ʕala	?al-maʕlumati?
know- you (Pl)		how I- get	on	the-information

'Do you know how I get the information?'

The question word /keyf/ is followed by a verb (or a noun as in keyf ?al-ḫaal) both in the Hejazi dialect and in Modern Standard Arabic. The child's question in (5) indicates adherence to the Equivalence Constraint by not violating the required syntactic elements. The verb /?aħṣulu/ 'to get or to find' is always followed by a prepositional phrase that is headed by the preposition /ʕala/. However, its equivalent in the HjD is /?alaagi/ requires a noun phrase as it's complement. Such discrepancy docs not indicate violation of the Equivalence Constraint; rather they specify how the lexical category of a complement is sometimes unpredictable; it is an idiosyncratic property of the verb selecting the argument, and must therefore be specified in the lexical entry of the verb (Fromkin 2000). Overall, the utterance in (5) provides further evidence to the fact that the code switching does occur at points where juxtaposition of L and H elements doesn't violate a syntactic rule of either varieties.

The Adjectival Phrase

While adjectival phrases in the High form do not appear in the data at all, the occurrence of single adjectives constitutes 20 % of code switching incidences. According to Sieny (1978), adjectives in the Hejazi dialect of Arabic function as noun modifiers (kitaab ʒadiid), complements in equational clauses (haada ?alfuraʃ mustaʕmal), and finally as heads in adjective phrases (marra zaki).

The most common use of High variety adjectives in this child's utterances is that of complements in equational clauses as in (6) below where the child is describing a movie character – an unpleasant mother:

Example (6)

haadi	?al-?um	?al-maakira
this	the-mother	the-cunning (F)

'This cunning mother'

Notably, the position of the adjective in (6) does not violate the syntax of Modern Standard Arabic. Nominal sentences usually consist of the subject – a noun or its equivalent about which a statement is made – and the predicate which specifies the idea of the existence of the subject. According to Cantarino (1974), this specification or modification is achieved through "... simple juxtaposition of the nominal predicate and the subject". An example from Modern Standard Arabic in this regard, will show an identical structure to the equational clause in (6) above:

Example (7)

huwa	binaa?un	kabiirun
it (M)	building	large

'It is a large building'

The sentence patterns in (6) and (7) are identical in a sense that the adjective in both verities occur at the same syntactic position. Hence, the child's use of the adjective /?al-maakirah/ instead of its equivalent in the Hejazi dialect /?al-makkaarah/ is totally legitimate in terms of the Equivalence Constraint.

Further support for the Equivalence Constraint is found in (8) where the adjective in the High form is preceded by the negator /muu/ 'be not'. In the HjD, this negator is a variation of /ma/ plus a modified form of the personal pronoun; hence we have /muu/, /mahu/ '(he) is not', /mahi/ '(she) is not', and /mahum/ '(they) are not', etc. This negator is never followed by verbs, but is always followed by adjectives (Sieny, 1978). However, the equivalent of this negator in Modern Standard Arabic is /laysa/ as in /laysa ʒamiilan/. Overall, the switch occurs in (8) at a point (after a negator) that is syntactically allowed in both varieties. This indicates total adherence to the syntactic structure of both the High and the Low variety.

Example (8)

ṣaħ	huwwa	muu	baariʕ
right	he	be not	skilful

'Isn't he unskilful?'

The adjective / baariʕ/ in (8) is in the High variety form. It occupies a slot that is usually occupied by an adjective either in the Hejazi dialect or in the High varieties of Arabic. Thus, the diglossic switch happens at a point where the syntactic structure of both varieties maps onto each other.

The Noun Phrase

Unlike bilingual code mixing where nouns are the most frequently mixed lexical items (Swain and Wesche; Lindholm and Padilla; cited in Genesee, 1989), single nouns in diglossic switching represent only 12 % of the data. However, this insertion of single nouns into the HjD utterances is well developed and rule governed. In the HjD, the typical syntactic slots that are usually filled by nouns are subject and object slots, heads in noun phrases and axis slot in prepositional phrases (Sieny, 1978).

Code switching instances that involve single nouns show great sensitivity to the syntactic positions of nouns. To illustrate this, consider example (9) below:

Example (9)

ʃuufi   <u>?al-xuuðah</u>

look at (F)   the-helmet (F)

'Look at the helmet'!

The verb /ʃuufi/ in the Hejazi dialect is a transitive verb that requires an object complement. Thus /?alxuuðah/ occupies the position of an object. The equivalent verb in Modern Standard Arabic is /?unẓuri/ which requires a prepositional phrase as its complement. This difference in argument assignments is associated with the information needed for the lexical entry of each word (as mentioned above), rather than being a violation of the Equivalence Constraint. Consequently, the noun in (9) above occurs at a point where the syntactic criterion of both varieties meet.

Needless to say, nouns occur initially in nominal sentences in both the HjD and Modern Standard Arabic. Data exhibit a certain amount of nominal sentences which consist of a noun and a predicate that attributes

something to that noun. The noun /?alkafiif/ occupies the first position in the nominal sentence (10) indicating no violation of syntactic surface structure of either varieties.

Example (10)

?alkafiif	zaʕlaan
the- blind (M)	sad (M)

'The blind man is sad'

Beside the occurrence of single nouns, complete noun phrases also appear in the data, but with a slightly lower frequency. The child's simple sentences show a large degree of development with regard to noun phrases and their internal structure (*i.e.*, in terms of agreement between noun and modifier). The verb /?aktub/ 'to write' is a transitive verb that requires an object noun phrase in both the Hejazi dialect and Modern Standard Arabic. Consider example (11) below:

Example (11)

?aktub	ʃai?un	haammun
I- write	something	important

'I write something important'

The noun phrase in (11) is in the High variety form since it retains the original nominative inflection from Standard Arabic /un/ plus the pronunciation of /?/ in the middle of the word /ʃai?un/ which is lost in the Hejazi dialect. While the noun phrase is essentially a High Arabic form appearing in a Low variety utterance, it is syntactically well positioned. Note, that the child's High system is still developing. Clearly he is not in command of the case marking system. He used the nominative inflection instead of the accusative case. Nevertheless, the noun phrase which is a High Arabic form that appears in a Hejazi dialect utterance is syntactically well positioned.

Additionally, Standard Arabic syntax has a specific structural construction where the object complement is derived from the verb itself. Consequently, this object has the same pronunciation and may be followed by a modifier that agrees with the noun in case. Al-Dahdah (1993) translates ?al-mafʕul ?al-muTlaq into 'absolute patient' whereas Ryding (2005) refers to it as the 'cognate accusative'. This construction

is used to confirm the verb or to show its nature and number. Examples of codeswitches involving the 'cognate accusative' construction are displayed in (12) a and b below:

Example (12)

a.	taʕibtu	taʕaban	ʃadiidan
	I- got tired	tiredness	very much
	'I got very tired'		
b.	fariħtu	faraħan	kaθiiran
	I. got happy	happiness	very much
	'I got very happy'		

Sentences a and b in (12) above show this type of object noun phrases with accusative case marker /an/ appearing on both the noun and the modifier. However, this construction also appears in the Hejazi dialect after verbs, though without the modifier as in /firiħt faraħ/.

Data obtained from the child reveal the use of 'absolute patient' constructions with mixed lexical items from both the High and Low varieties of Arabic. Interestingly enough, the child's code switching pattern in this case displays the use of verbs in the Low variety form and the use of 'absolute patient' in the High variety form. Thus, the diglossic switch occurs at a point where there is no violation of both varieties' surface structures. To illustrate the above remarks consider example (13):

Example (13)

ʔazʕal	ġaḏab	ʃadiid
I. got angry	anger	very much
'I got very angry'		

The verb /ʔazʕal/ is from the Hejazi dialect while the 'absolute patient' construction /ġaḏab ʃadiid/ is from the High variety except for the loss of the accusative suffix /an/. The manifestation of this construction in the data supports the Equivalence Constraint where the position of 'absolute patient' doesn't violate the syntax of either variety.

The Adverbial Phrase

As mentioned above, mixing adverbial phrases constitutes only 8 % of the data. Such kind of mixing, as was found, also occurs at points where the structure of both the Hejazi dialect and the High varieties maps onto each other. Two kinds of adverbs appear in the child's speech, namely time adverbs and manner adverbs. The use of time adverbs is represented in (14) below:

Example (14)

?amsaku	<u>tawaal</u>	<u>?alwaqt</u>
I-hold-it	all	the-time

'I hold it all the time'

The time adverbial phrase is in the High form occupying the position of adverbs in the Hejazi dialect. Time adverbs in the HjD, such as /saʕaat/, and /baʕdein/ usually follow the verbs although they can also precede verbs as in / baʕdein ?aruuħ/ (Sieny, 1978). However, this position is also manifested in Modern Standard Arabic, thus yielding no violation of any structure.

Manner adverbs in the High form also appear without violation of the Equivalence Constraint. Consider the utterance in (15):

Example (15)

liʕibt	?alluʕba	<u>biquwwa</u>
I. played	the-game	strongly

'I played the game strongly'

The manner adverb in (15) above shows parallelism with (14) with regard to the position of the adverbial phrase (after verbs) either in the Hejazi variety or in the High variety, thus mixing here is rule governed and follows adult norms in this regard.

The Prepositional Phrase

In addition to the above grammatical categories, prepositional phrases can also be mixed in this child's speech. It should be mentioned here that prepositions themselves like /fii/, /ʕan/, and /ʕala/ appear in the Hejazi dialect in the same form as in the High variety. What really differs

is the noun phrase complement that follows the prepositions in the construction. In Modern Standard Arabic, this noun phrase has a reduced ending manifested in /i/ or /in/. In contrast, the Hejazi dialect's reduced nouns (as most nouns in other phrase constructions) have lost this inflection. However, the syntactic position of prepositional phrases in the child's speech is identical to those of both High and Low varieties. An examination of (16) below will provide further clarification:

Example (16)

?alħagi	niħna	fii	ma?ziq kabiir
hurry on	we	in	trouble big

'Hurry on! We are in a big trouble'

The reduced noun /ma?ziq/ and its modifier /kabiir/ are in the High form with the exception of the omission of the case marker /in/. They complement the preposition /fii/ within the S-bar level /niħna fii ma?ziq kabiir/ where the pronoun /niħna/ appears first in this nominal sentence and the prepositional phrase is the predicate. Prepositional phrases that function as predicates in nominal sentences have the same syntactic position in both the High and the Low varieties. The child's use of prepositional phrases in environments that are allowed syntactically reflects adherence to the Equivalence Constraint.

Another manifestation of prepositional phrases where the reduced complement is a pronoun rather than a noun is also observed in the child's utterances. Such kind of constructions appears in the Hejazi dialect, but again without case marking inflections. The child's sentence in (17) shows code switching of prepositional phrases with a bound pronoun as the complement of the preposition.

Example (17)

ʤibt	haada	laki
I. brought	this	for you

'I brought this for you'

The only slight difference between the High and Low varieties regarding this kind of prepositional phrases is pronunciation. Where such construction is pronounced in the Hejazi dialect as /liiki/, it is pronounced in the High form of Arabic as / laki/, thus yielding occurrence of different variety forms. However, both prepositional phrases in (16) and (17) above support the claim that code switching is

well developed and appear at points where there is no violation of both varieties' syntactic surface structure, that is to say the basic assumption behind the Equivalence Constraint.

The above diglossic switches, however, can also be considered at the noun phrase level rather than at the prepositional phrase level since there are no linguistic differences between prepositions in both High and Low varieties of Arabic.

Conclusion

Previous research has shown that when bilingual children code mix, their productions show obedience to the structural constraints of the matrix or host language (Vihman 1998; Paradis, Nicoladis and Genesee 2000). Additionally, instances of adult diglossic code mixing are expected to observe the Equivalence Constraints because of the great similarity between the High and Low varieties[(6)].

What is significant here is the fact that young children who have not yet demonstrated full competence of the High variety of Arabic (due to minimum exposure) are, nevertheless, sensitive to the similarities between the two varieties. Their diglossic switching is rule governed and adheres to the Equivalence Constraint (Poplack 1980). In other words, instances of diglossic switching found in the productions of the young subject reported here do not violate the syntactic structure of the Hejazi dialect and the High variety of Arabic or MSA. Note, however, that mixing seems to favor lexical items over phrasal categories and, interestingly enough, verbs are found to be the most frequently mixed linguistic items although they are morphologically more complex than other categories.

The phenomenon of *developmental diglossia* reported here which is (a) not the result of formal education but acquired by young perschoolers and (b) is used for ordinary or daily conversations calls for the need to modify the long embraced definition of diglossia proposed by Ferguson (1959). The phenomenon requires further investigation in relation to various aspects, such as social functions,

---

(6) (Myers-Scotton, personal communication, March 6th, 2006).

contextual factors, the role of input as well as the earlier phases in which diglossia might start to emerge.

References

Al-Dahdah, A. (1993) *A Dictionary of Arabic Grammatical Nomenclature: Arabic-English*, Beirut, Al-Nashiroun Pub.

Belazi, H.M., Rubin, E.J. and **Toribio, J.** (1994) Code-switching and X-bar Theory: The Functional Head Constraint, *Linguistic Inquiry*, **25**: 221-237.

Bentahila, A. and **Davies, E.E.** (1983) The Syntax of Arabic-French Code-switching, *Lingua*, **59:** 301-330.

Berk-Seligson, S. (1986) Linguistic Constraints on Intrasentential Code-switching, *Language in Society*, **15:** 313-348.

Cantarino, V. (1974) *The Syntax of Modern Arabic Prose I*, London: Bloomington.

Clyne, M. (2005) *Constraints on Code-switching: How Universal are they?*, In: **Li Wei** (ed.), *The Bilingualism Reader*, London: Routledge, 257-280.

Di Sciullo, A.M., Muysken, P. and **Singh, R.** (1986) Government and Codemixing, *Journal of Linguistics*, **22:** 1-24.

Ferguson, C.A. (1959) Diglossia. *Word*, **15:** 325-340.

Fromkin, V.A. (ed.) (2000). *Linguistics: An Introduction to Linguistic Theory*, London: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Genesee, F. (1989) Early Bilingual Language Development: One Language or Two? *Journal of Child language*, **16:** 161-179.

Heath, J. (1989) *From Code Switching to Borrowing: Foreign and Diglossic Mixing in Moroccan Arabic*, London: Kegan Paul International.

Khamis-Dakwar, R. (2006) Lexical Processing in Two Language Varieties: An Event-related Brain Potential Study of Arabic, *Paper Presented at the 20th Arabic Linguistics Symposium, March 3-5*, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Maamouri, M. (1998) Arabic Diglossia and its Impact on the Quality of Education in the Arab World, *Paper Presented at The World Bank: The Mediterranean Development Forum, September 3-6*, Marrakech.

MacSwan, J. (1999) *A Minimalist Approach to Intrasentential Code Switching*, London: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1986) Diglossia and Code-switching, In: **J.A. Fishman**, (ed.), *The Fergusonian Impact*, **2:** 403-15.

________ (1993) *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

________ (1993a) Common and Uncommon Ground: Social and Structural Factors in Codeswitching, *Language and Society*, **22:** 475-503.

________ (2006) *Multiple Voices: an Introduction to Bilingualism*, London: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Pfaff, C. (1979) Constraints on Language Mixing: Intrasentential Code-switching and Borrowing in Spanish/English, *Language*, **55:** 291-318.

Paradis, J., Nicoladis, E. and **Fred, G.** (2000) Early Emergence of Structural Constraint on Code Mixing: Evidence From French-English Bilingual Children, *Journal of Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, **3**: 245-261.

Poplack, S. (1980) Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish y Termino en Espanol: Toward a Typology of Code Switching, *Linguistics*, **18:** 581-618.

________. (1981) Syntactic Structure and Social Function of Code-Swtiching In **R. Duran** (ed.), *Latino Discourse and Communicative Behaviour*, Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 169-184.

Ryding, K. (2005) *A Reference Grammar of Modern Standard Arabic*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sankoff, D. and **Poplack, S.** (1981) A Formal Grammar for Code-switching, *Papers on Linguistics*, **14**: 3-46.

Sieny, M. (1978) *The Syntax of Urban Hejazi Arabic*, London: Longman.

Tager-Flusberg, H. (1989) Putting Words Together: Morphology and Syntax in Preschool Years, In: **J. Berko-Gleason** (ed.) *The Development of Language*, London: Merrill Publishing Company.

Vihman, M.M. (1998) A Developmental Perspective on Codeswitching: Conversations Between a Pair of Bilingual Siblings, *International Journal of Bilingualism*, **2**(1): 45-84.

Wei, Li (ed.) (2005) *The Bilingualism Reader*, London: Routledge

Wright, W., Smith, W.R. and **De Goeje, M.J. (eds.)** (1971) *A Grammar of the Arabic Language I*, London: Cambridge University Press.

الثنائية اللهجية التطورية: الاختلاط اللغوي ومبدأ التكافؤ النحوي

منى حسين صابر وصباح محمد صافي

مركز اللغة الإنجليزية وقسم اللغات الأوروبية وآدابها، جامعة الملك عبدالعزيز، جدة، المملكة العربية السعودية

monahtsabir@hotmail.com ، sabahsafi@hotmail.com

المستخلص. جذبت ظاهرة ثنائية اللهجة اهتمام الباحثين منذ مدة بعيدة. وقد تمت دراستها باسهاب فيما يتعلق بحديث الكبار، ولكن لم تتم دراسة هذه الظاهرة في حديث الأطفال الذين هم في سن ما قبل المدرسة الذين لم يتعرضوا للغة العربية الفصحى من خلال التعليم المباشر. إن هذه الدراسة تعنى بتقديم أدلة تدل على وجود ظاهرة الثنائية اللهجية في حديث الأطفال من خلال بيانات أخذت من طفل في عمر الخامسة وستة أشهر والذي اتسم حديثه باختلاط لغوي عفوي من اللهجة العامية (الحجازية) إلى اللغة العربية الفصحى. ولقد ظهر أن الاختلاط اللغوي في حديث هذا الطفل منهجي، ويتقيد بمبدأ التكافؤ النحوي الذي طرحته بابلاك عام ١٩٨٠م مما يدل على مقدرة الطفل المبكرة على معرفة البناء النحوي للهجتين. إضافة إلى ذلك، فقد وجدت الدراسة أن الأفعال هي أكثر العناصر اللغوية المختلطة، على الرغم من أنها أكثر العناصر اللغوية تعقيدًا من حيث التركيب النحوي والدلالة.